

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 2071 of 1988

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

- =====
1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

UMEDBHAI VASTARAM PATEL

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MR MC SHAH for Petitioner No. 1

MR DP JOSHI, AGP, for Respondent No. 1-2

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE D.A.MEHTA

Date of decision: 14/09/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The petitioner, who was working as a Taluka Development Officer has challenged, by way of this petition, the order of suspension at Annexure 'B' seeking direction to quash and set aside the said order. The petitioner has also sought consequential benefits.

However, in view of the subsequent facts which have come on record along with affidavit-in-reply filed on behalf of the Respondents, it is not necessary to deal with the contentions raised in the petition or set out the facts in detail.

2. It appears that during pendency of the present petition, the petitioner preferred another Special Civil Application No.10280 of 1996 which was disposed of by this Court on 12th February, 1997 (Coram : M.R.Calla, J). Thereafter, the petitioner preferred one more Special Civil Application No.3805 of 1997 which was admitted by this Court by order dated 5th December, 1997 (Coram : Miss R.M.Doshit, J). This second petition viz. Special Civil Application No.3805 of 1997 was finally disposed of on 6th May, 1999 by this Court (Coram : S.K.Keshote, J) by issuing the directions contained in the said order.

3. In view of the aforesaid position, as the two subsequent petitions which were heard and finally disposed of involving the same subject matter, the present petition has become infructuous.

We accordingly reject this petition on this limited count. Rule discharged with no order as to costs.

(D.A.Mehta, J)

'Bhavesh'